

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-19 are respectfully requested. Applicants have attempted to address every ground for rejection in the Office Action dated February 7, 2006 (Paper No. 022006) and believe the application is now in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention.

Claims 1-5 and 7-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffmann (U.S. Pat. No. 5,982,884) in view of Lloyd et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,127,802). Hoffmann discloses a cell phone charging stand having a holding base 7 and a supporting base 5 which are connected through a pivot support 29. The holding base 7 holds the cell phone 3, and the supporting base 5 pivots about the holding base to support the cell phone in a generally vertical orientation. (Col. 3, ll. 59-66). Lloyd discloses a battery charger 100 having a pocket 102 for charging a battery 118. A pivotable door 104 closes the pocket 102. (Col. 2, ll. 40-50).

In contrast, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate features of cancelled claims 5 and 8, and now recites, among other things, “a base having a docking recess for receiving and supporting the appliance, said base having electrical contacts in communication with said recess for charging the battery and at least one socket for supplying power from the external power source to the

contacts, said docking recess defining a pocket surrounding a lower portion of the appliance upon insertion of the appliance into said pocket....wherein said base includes a latch which releasably secures said base and said cover together, and a groove on a surface of said base opposite from said recess for receiving an edge of said cover for supporting said base in said second, open position.”

Applicants submit that neither Hoffmann nor Lloyd, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all of the features recited in amended claim 1.

Specifically, Hoffmann fails to disclose any of a latch, groove, or defined pocket as recited in amended claims 1 and 15. As seen in Fig. 4 of Hoffman, the phone 3 rests in storage space 9 of lid 7. However, a lower portion of the phone 3 is not “surrounded” by a “docking recess defining a pocket,” as recited in amended claim 1. Further, in Hoffman, when the lid 7 is hinged open and the base 5 is placed on a support surface 35, the edge of the lid 7 merely rests upon the base 5, rather than being received in “a groove on a surface of said base opposite from said recess,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Also, Applicants submit that Hoffman fails to recognize the problem of maintaining electrical continuity during repeated opening and closing of the stand. The arrangement in Hoffman is prone to deterioration or disconnect of the wiring in response to such use because the connector 41 is in the lid 7, while the wiring is in the cover 5. (Fig. 4). In contrast, in the present charging stand, both

the appliance and the electrical contacts and wiring are located in the base, preventing disconnect of the wiring.

Lloyd discloses a retention latch 105 configured for engaging a retention latch recess 109 and holding the charger door 104 shut when a battery is not being charged. (Col. 2, ll. 48-55). When the battery 118 is being charged, the door latch 105 is in contact with battery end 120, and acts to maintain an electrical connection between the battery and the charger electrical contacts 117. (Col. 3, ll. 39-42). However, the latch is not configured for releasably securing the base and cover of the charger together, as recited in amended claim 1. Further, Lloyd fails to disclose a “groove on a surface of said base opposite from said recess for receiving an edge of said cover for supporting said base in said second, open position,” as recited in amended claim 1. (Fig. 3). Also, as seen in Fig. 3 of Lloyd, the pocket 103 does not surround “a lower portion of the appliance upon insertion of the appliance into said pocket,” as recited in amended claim 1, but rather merely defines a resting spot for the battery 118.

Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate features of claim 1 and cancelled claims 5 and 8, and now recites, among other things, “a base having a docking recess for receiving and supporting the appliance, said base having electrical contacts in communication with said recess for charging the battery and at least one socket for supplying power from the external power source to the contacts, said docking recess defining a pocket configured for surrounding a lower portion of the appliance upon insertion of the appliance into said pocket, said

socket securing the appliance in said base and maintaining a connection with said electrical contacts for recharging said battery, said base including a latch which releasably secures said base and said cover together, and a generally transverse groove on a surface of said base opposite from said recess for receiving an edge of said cover to support said cover in said second, open position.”

Applicants submit that neither Hoffman nor Lloyd, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all of the features recited in amended claim 15. Specifically, as discussed above, the pocket or storage space 9 in Hoffman does not surround “a lower portion of the appliance upon insertion of the appliance into said pocket,” as recited in amended claim 15, but rather the phone 3 merely rests in the storage space 9. Further, as seen in Fig. 4 of Hoffman, when the lid 7 is in the open position, it rests on the case 5, but there is no groove or other feature “on a surface of said base opposite from said recess for receiving an edge of said cover to support said cover in said second, open position,” as recited in amended claim 15.

Also, Applicants submit that Hoffman fails to recognize the problem of maintaining electrical continuity between the appliance and the stand during repeated opening and closing of the stand. Specifically, amended claim 15 features a base having a docking recess and electrical contacts in communication with the recess, so that the appliance and contacts/wiring are located in the same component (i.e., the base). In contrast, in Hoffman, the electrical components and

wiring are located in the cover 5, rather than the lid 7, where the phone 3 and electrical connector 41 are located.

As seen in Fig. 3 of Lloyd and as discussed above, the pocket 103 in Lloyd is not “configured for surrounding a lower portion of the appliance upon insertion of the appliance into said pocket,” as recited in amended claim 15. Also, the latch 105 is not configured for releasably securing the base and the cover together, as recited in amended claim 15, but rather the latch 105 acts to maintain a connection between the battery 118 and the electrical contacts 117 when the battery is being charged. (Fig. 3). Further, Lloyd fails to disclose a “transverse groove for receiving an edge of said cover to support said cover in said second, open position,” as recited in amended claim 15. Indeed, Lloyd fails to disclose any type of groove for supporting the battery 118 when the door 104 is in the open position.

Applicants further submit that there is no motivation or incentive to modify Hoffmann as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C 103(a).

In view of the above amendments, the application is respectfully submitted to be in allowable form. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be

Serial No.: 10/614,668
Filed: July 7, 2003

resolved by a telephone interview, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Rebecca L. Uryga
Registration No. 53,713

Customer No. 24978

May 5, 2006
Suite 2500
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6501
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315